

Actuarial balance under H.R. 1, expressed as percentages of taxable payroll  
COMPUTATIONS ON PERPETUITY BASIS

Item	OASDI	Hospital Insurance	Total
Actuarial balance of present system	-0.24		-0.24
Earnings base of \$5,600	+0.31		+0.31
Revised contribution schedule	+0.20	+0.89	+1.09
Extensions of coverage	+0.03		+0.03
Benefit increase of 7 percent	-0.00		-0.00
Hospitalization and related benefits		-0.84	-0.84
Total effect of changes	-0.06	+0.05	-0.01
Actuarial balance under proposal	-0.30	+0.05	-0.25

COMPUTATIONS ON 75-YEAR COST BASIS<sup>2</sup>

Actuarial balance of present system	+0.01		+0.01
Earnings base of \$5,600	+0.31		+0.31
Revised contribution schedule	+0.20	+0.89	+1.09
Extensions of coverage	+0.03		+0.03
Benefit increase of 7 percent	-0.58		-0.58
Hospitalization and related benefits		-0.84	-0.84
Total effect of changes	-0.04	+0.05	+0.01
Actuarial balance under proposal	-0.03	+0.05	+0.02

<sup>1</sup> The 7-percent increase applies only on the first \$400 of average monthly wage.

<sup>2</sup> Following is a breakdown of the 0.84-percent cost of the health benefits:

	Percent
Hospitalization benefits	0.78
Extended care benefits	.02
Outpatient diagnostic services	.01
Home nursing care	.03
Total	.84

<sup>3</sup> Basis recommended by Advisory Council on Social Security.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and others in cosponsoring this bill, S. 1 providing hospital and nursing home care for older citizens. It very rightly has priority in the legislative work of the 89th Congress because it presents a reasonable and practical solution to the health problems and worries of senior Americans.

This bill offers a workable combination of social security protection, private insurance help, and Federal Government backing. It is based on the sound concept of insurance programs—that an individual pays a relatively small amount regularly—no more than 5.2 percent of his earnings for all social security coverage including the added medical benefits—throughout his working life. His employer pays the same amount. Then when he retires, he has what amounts to a paid-up insurance policy to cover the hospital expenses that may arise later in life when his income will be smaller but his health expenses will probably be greater. This pay-as-you-go insurance program is a typical example of the practical approach to national problems which has characterized American growth from earliest pioneer days. It offers people a chance to be self-sufficient without denying them the opportunity to select their own doctors, their own hospitals, and their own private insurance to supplement the basic social security payments if they wish.

This approach was enthusiastically endorsed by the Advisory Council on Social Security in its recent report. With only one dissenting voice, the com-

mittee concluded that the monthly cash payments now provided by social security are not enough to provide real protection against high and unpredictable costs of health care. They recommended an insurance program, under social security, to help Americans pay their health bills by paying their premiums during the years when they are best able to do so.

The fact is that expensive illnesses are much more likely and frequent in old age. Every year, one out of six persons over 65 is hospitalized. Nearly everyone who reaches age 65 is hospitalized at least once during his later years and most are hospitalized two or more times. On the average, an older person requires almost three times as much hospital care as a younger one.

Yet, over the last decade, costs of medical care have risen 36 percent and hospitalization expenses have risen 65 percent. The median income of aged couples in 1962 was only \$2,875. Many people, especially in rural areas, must get along on a fraction of that amount. For them, a major illness or even a fall or similar accident can wipe out the savings of a lifetime because they are no longer able to go to work and use their earning power to replenish savings.

Today there are over 18 million persons age 65 or older in the United States. These senior citizens deserve and are entitled to the best health care in their later years that our Nation can give them. These citizens are able and willing to pay for such care—not in sudden catastrophic medical bills, during their later years but in regular annual insurance payments, through their working years, under the social security system.

That is the approach that this bill offers. It has been carefully studied, revised, and improved over the last few years. Now, I believe it is a sound plan to help people help themselves, to reduce dependence on welfare and means tests, and to provide better health care for our senior citizens. I am very glad to cosponsor S. 1.

THE PRIVATE SECTOR OF MEDICARE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I assure Senators that I shall take only a moment. I appreciate the presence in the Chamber of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], because today he introduced the administration's bill for medical care for the aged, in which I feel it an honor to have joined with my colleagues the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. President, as introduced, the bill contains the private sector amendment which has been identified with my name. I believe that that fact has not been adequately noted in respect to the introduction of the bill today. I believe that it should be very carefully noted because it is a critically important part of the bill. The reason is the following:

First, the bill originally, as the King-Anderson bill, provided a limited amount of health care—with nothing more—in the form of hospitalization, and con-

cerned many people who might otherwise have supported it on the ground that the process of political "bidding up" might cause a far greater intrusion, in their view, into the health field by the government than would be justified either by the social security taxes which were being paid or by the preservation of the integrity of the doctor-patient relationship.

The private sector amendment would provide a built-in guarantee that at every stage an effort would be made to do that. The private enterprise system can compete in carrying the additional responsibility, and it seems to me that that is one of the surest guarantees and assurances to those who might have some doubts on the question as to whether the tendency will be to limit the Federal Government's role very strongly to the hospitalization provision.

Second, the provision would follow the concept of self-help, because 80 percent of the aged, based upon their incomes, could pay a reasonable premium for health care coverage—and these are the important words—when it is added to the hospitalization feature under social security, which is the most expensive element of the whole program.

Then, at a modest cost, a possibility would be opened. A great committee which I inspired, which was headed by Arthur Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, spent a year studying the subject and reported a cost in the area of \$2 per person per month, which would come within the competence of 80 percent of the aged, leaving the other 20 percent to the possibility of the Kerr-Mills bill, if need be.

In that way, in the bill introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and many other Senators there would be presented a complete program for health care for the aged with a magnificent role for the private sector.

Here is the important point, and upon this note I wish to conclude: In my judgment, the proposal offers one of the most challenging opportunities ever extended to the insurance companies of the United States. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is himself in the insurance business and is fully cognizant of it. Something must be done about the problem of medical care for the aged. If we are to keep Government within reasonable limits, and if we are to keep the social security tax within reasonable limits, only a relatively modest amount can be done by Government. That amount is estimated at about 30 percent of the total cost of health care for the aged.

The overwhelming bulk of it must be done by the private enterprise system. I say to all Senators, especially to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], that at the time when we consider the measure—and I have no doubt that this is the most auspicious time we have ever had for its consideration—I shall do everything I can, and I hope other Senators will feel exactly the same way—to bring about a situation in which, when the measure is passed, we shall have before us at one and the same time a proposal from the great insurers

January 6

of the United States to pick up the private sector option and really make the bill operative, so as to provide not only limited health care and hospitalization, but total health care, that the overwhelming bulk of the older people, especially people over 65 years of age, can pay for.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say to the Senator from New York that the panel which he inspired, organized, and had established was a helpful group.

Many of us had tried to find a solution to this problem by seeking a way to encourage insurance companies to participate in the medical care program. It was very difficult; but the panel which the able Senator from New York assembled, including Marion B. Folsom, Arthur Larsen, and Arthur Flemming—many of them of a different political belief from my own—have devised a wonderful program, made great contributions, and reached conclusions with which, although I may not finally agree with them, were the result of a search for a good solution.

Many times I have commended privately, and also in public, the able senior Senator from New York for bringing together this group of men, to make certain that their contributions were ready. Since they were ready, we tried to draft a bill this year, and we hope that when the bill is finally passed, it will contain the very fine provisions that the Javits panel has worked out.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a statement issued by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and myself on yesterday with reference to our cosponsorship.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATORS CASE, JAVITS, AND KUCHEL TO COSPONSOR MEDICARE BILL**

We are proposing to cosponsor the administration's bill for medical care for the aged because we believe it is in substance the plan which passed the Senate in the last session. It contains a major role for the private sector in affording not only limited hospital care under social security financing, but providing the opportunity for total health care for all aging citizens. We consider this plan to be creative and constructive. Such a major role in medical care for the aging on the part of the private sector was the basis of the Republican initiative taken in the introduction of our public-private medical care for the aging bill in the last Congress.

The private sector provision of the current bill allows private insurance carriers and health service groups to cover medical and surgical costs on a nonprofit basis over and above the limited hospital insurance of the King-Anderson bill, and on a basis of cost low enough to be available to the overwhelming majority of our aging citizens. This private sector provision also acts as a built-in Governor against unlimited Federal expansion in the medical care for the aging field.

The four points which we have long felt should be included in an acceptable medical

care plan for the aging are incorporated in the bill which we will cosponsor. They are: (1) inclusion of the estimated 2½ million Americans over 65 not covered by the social security system; (2) provision for participation by the private insurance industry to make up total health care; (3) provision for use of approved private organizations and State bodies in the administration of the program; and (4) establishment of a separate health insurance trust fund into which all Federal health care funds shall be deposited.

We consider the chances for passage of this bill to be auspicious in this session. We consider the effort to be bipartisan, as it was the private sector provision which provided that Republican support in 1964 and provided the margin required to pass the Anderson-Gore-Javits amendment in the Senate.

We believe this is the time to provide an effective program for medical care for the aging fully consistent with the encouragement of private enterprise, the satisfaction of the national need and the protection against excesses. We believe also that the fundamental structure which this bill provides is the sound basis upon which private sector interest in medical care for the aging can be enlisted in the total effort.

Other Republican Senators are also giving consideration to cosponsoring this measure.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his thoughtful approach to this subject. It does much to provide a good bill and affords an opportunity to the medical profession to have a privately operated program that can function in harmony with the proposal which will be made in the Gore amendment to modify the King-Anderson bill.

*Bill file*  
**CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET**

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, once again I submit, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and 34 other Members of the U.S. Senate, a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. This proposed legislation is well known to many Members of this body, since between 1952 and 1964, the Senate has approved similar or identical measures, overwhelmingly, on six occasions.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation is designed to remedy serious deficiencies in our appropriation procedures and in the expenditure of public funds. It constitutes, in my judgment, a positive approach toward the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations.

The purpose of this bill is to provide the Congress with the machinery necessary to enable it to meet its constitutional responsibilities with respect to the appropriation of funds required for the conduct of the Federal Government. It seeks to accomplish this objective by establishing a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of members of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, which would assist the Congress in exercising adequate control over the expenditure of public funds by the executive branch of the Government. This proposed Joint Committee on the Budget would be staffed with nonpartisan fiscal experts and technicians who would be engaged in making continuing studies of programs and expenditures proposed by the executive branch, 12

months of the year. The establishment of this joint committee would provide the Congress with the same type and caliber of detailed, technical information, in the appropriation field, as the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation provides for the revenue committees of the Congress, and as the Bureau of the Budget provides for the executive branch.

One of the most serious problems confronting our Nation today is the maintenance of national solvency in the face of ever-growing demands on the Federal Government for programs and services, coupled with the necessity of meeting the national defense requirements of the cold war and the atomic and space age. Our national expenditures budget has grown from \$67.5 billion in fiscal year 1954 to an estimated \$98.4 billion in fiscal year 1964, and an estimated \$97.9 billion for fiscal year 1965. Present indications are that they will be in the neighborhood of \$100 billion in fiscal year 1966. Thus, we are rapidly moving toward an annual expenditures budget in excess of \$100 billion, and toward annual expenditures in all categories that will exceed \$150 billion, bearing in mind that approximately \$25 billion in annual spending does not appear in the appropriation budget. Finally, our national debt, as of June 30, 1964, has reached an all-time high of \$311.7 billion, and is expected to reach approximately \$317 billion by June 30, 1965.

Mr. President, this matter is of the gravest concern to the Congress, since, from the formation of our Government down to the present time, it has been clearly understood that the Constitution vested in the Congress—and the Congress alone—the exclusive right to appropriate money for the various branches of the Federal Government, and to designate the purposes for which the money shall be used.

Although we are now operating in an era of annual expenditures budgets in the neighborhood of \$100 billion, the procedures used by the Congress in carrying out these vital responsibilities are practically no different than those used 25 or 50 years ago. In other words, the methods and procedures which we now use in the appropriation processes are simply inadequate to meet present-day needs and requirements.

In January 1950, after having served 1 year as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I became convinced that under procedures then in use, which were no different than those presently followed, the Appropriations Committees of both Houses were laboring under a tremendous disadvantage in their efforts to pass upon budget requests for Federal expenditures. The fundamental problem which I found to exist at that time—and it still exists today—is due to the fact that the Congress, which is most generous in equipping the executive branch agencies with personnel to handle its affairs, has simply failed to provide itself with adequate machinery to carry out one of its most vital functions and responsibilities—the appropriation of funds for the conduct of the Government.

Instead of equipping itself with an adequate number of experts and technicians to examine every detail of the appropriation requests submitted by executive branch agencies and departments, the Congress has been content to limp along without the staff assistance and fiscal data and information it requires. Thus, aside from the overburdened housekeeping staffs of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, which cannot possibly make the kind of analysis of budget requests which is necessary in the time available, members of the Appropriations Committees are forced to rely upon the testimony of representatives of the executive branch who formulate the programs and present them in a light most favorable to their purposes. Furthermore, they usually tell us only as little or as much as they desire to disclose.

Accordingly, on January 19, 1950, I introduced a bill, S. 2898, which was similar, in many respect, to the pending bill. The committee studied the bill and revised it, but took no further action on it during the 81st Congress. Thereafter, the committee reported favorably, and the Senate passed, in the 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, 87th, and 88th Congresses, virtually identical bills proposing the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget. On each occasion, following Senate passage, the measure was permitted to die in the House of Representatives.

In each Congress, these bills were cosponsored by a substantial majority of the Members of the Senate. In the 85th Congress, 71 Members of a total of 96 cosponsored the measure; in the 87th Congress, there were 67 cosponsors; and in the 88th Congress, the bill had the largest number of sponsors it has ever had—77 Senators.

As majority leader in the Senate, President Johnson gave his active support to this proposed legislation, which passed the Senate unanimously in each of these Congresses. In his state of the Union message to the Congress on January 4, 1965, the President set out as a part of his national agenda, a proposal to "make an all-out campaign against waste and inefficiency." The President stated that he would submit special messages with detailed proposals for national action with this objective in mind. I know of no better way for the Congress to support the President's program for promoting economy and efficiency in Government than by the passage of this bill. It conforms specifically with his stated objective that "we will continue along the path toward a balanced budget in a balanced economy."

This bill is also in accord with the President's statement that wherever waste is found in Government, it will be eliminated. This legislation, if enacted into law, will aid the President in attaining this objective.

President Kennedy joined as a cosponsor of this proposed legislation, as a U.S. Senator, in the 85th Congress. President Eisenhower, on December 2, 1959, released a memorandum prepared by the Director of the Bureau of the

Budget setting forth proposals directed toward effecting improvements in budgeting, which included the proposal to create a Joint Committee on the Budget stating that its "objective is in line with the viewpoint expressed in the budget message," as a budget reform requiring congressional initiative and action. The proposal to create a Joint Committee on the Budget was also approved by Mr. Frederick Lawton, Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the Truman administration.

It appears perfectly clear that the conditions which prompted the introduction of this measure, in 1950, and its initial passage by the U.S. Senate, in 1952, have in no way diminished. On the contrary, they have increased with the rising cost of Government and the swelling of the national debt. We have only to compare our national expenditures budget of \$39.5 billion in fiscal year 1950, and \$65.3 billion in fiscal year 1952, with the fiscal year 1965 estimate of \$97.9 billion, to get the full impact of the current picture. If that is not sufficient, compare, if you will, our national debt of \$257.3 billion in 1950, and \$259.1 billion in 1952, with the \$312 billion which constituted our national debt as of June 30, 1964—an increase since June 30, 1952, of in excess of \$53 billion in the national debt alone.

An additional important factor to be considered in connection with this bill is the breakdown in our appropriations procedure which occurred during the 87th Congress, and which is a matter of the greatest concern to all of us. It is my firm conviction that if this bill had been enacted into law earlier, and the proposed joint committee had been in operation, this breakdown would not have occurred. I say this because I believe that the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Budget will be conducive to a better cooperation and a spirit of working in harmony between the two Appropriations Committees of the Congress. If we can have members of these committees working together, each receiving the same information, each using the same tools, and each relying on the technical advice and information furnished by a joint staff, they will be able to obtain more complete information and to evaluate more intelligently the budget requests made by the various agencies of Government. This, in turn, should go a long way toward removing the frictions and disagreements which have cropped up between the two bodies, from time to time, in connection with the appropriation process.

Mr. President, although the Senate has been endeavoring, for more than 14 years, to effect the necessary improvements in the fiscal operations of the legislative process, the House of Representatives has so far failed to act favorably on this proposal. I am convinced that a majority of the Members of that body are as much interested in correcting serious deficiencies in the appropriation procedures of the Congress as are Members of the Senate. This is evidenced by the fact that to my knowledge 26 Members of the House had introduced iden-

tical or similar bills when the staff of the Committee on Government Operations made a count of such bills early in the first session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. President, in closing, may I say that it is my sincere and fervent hope that this or a similar measure will be enacted into law at this session of the Congress. The American taxpayer has a very real and vital stake in this legislation. We should not fail him.

Mr. President, among the sponsors of the bill which I am introducing today are included all members of the Committee on Government Operations, which has reported this measure to the Senate in preceding Congresses. In view of the interest numerous other Senators have manifested in this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be held at the desk for 10 days, so that other Members of the Senate who may desire to do so may include their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be held at the desk as requested; and will be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### PUBLIC WORKS AND OTHER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide public works and other economic development programs for the rehabilitation of the economy of the Appalachian region. I ask unanimous consent that the measure be held at the desk until the close of business on next Thursday, January 14, that other Senators may have the opportunity to join in sponsorship.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Members will recall that the Senate, on September 25, 1964, passed the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 by a vote of 45 to 13. Unfortunately, during the closing days of the 88th Congress, the other body was unable to bring the legislation to a vote.

Since the adjournment of the 88th Congress President Johnson has repeatedly expressed his desire for early action on the Appalachian program by the 89th Congress, and has ranked this

January 6

bill among the highest priority measures of his legislative program.

I am gratified that our esteemed majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] concurred in this judgment on a "Meet the Press" telecast last Sunday evening, and expressed the conviction that this would be the first major legislation passed by the Senate in the 89th Congress.

Mr. President, during the adjournment I had occasion to visit a number of communities in the Appalachian region, in other States as well as the State of West Virginia. I found a deep-seated and continuing interest in this legislation which has already stimulated much thought and planning at the local and State levels. The people of Appalachia are anxious for the enactment of this program so that their region also may begin to move toward the great society which the President eloquently depicted in his state of the Union message.

Mr. President, in this connection, I invite attention to the fact that there are 35 Senators whose names are on the bill which I have presented to the Senate. I wish to make special reference to the cosponsorship of the eminent Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who was most active in the development of this measure in the 88th Congress. I do this in a sense because sponsors of the measure come from all sections of the country and from both parties.

The measure is substantially the same bill passed by this body last year by a majority of more than three to one. I, therefore, endorse the view expressed by the majority leader that the bill should not require extensive hearings. It is my hope that the Committee on Public Works will conduct brief but adequate hearings, then complete committee action on the measure, and report it to the Senate before the end of January.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for 5 days so that others who wish to do so may have an opportunity to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will lie at the desk, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to join my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], in introducing the proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965—S. 3—which is similar to the bill we worked to develop in the last Congress, and which the Senate passed by a vote of 45 to 13 before adjournment.

The programs proposed in this bill represent the work of the Appalachian Governors, the work which we in the Senate began over 6 years ago, and the great interest which both President Kennedy and President Johnson have given to this region.

I have spoken often on this subject, for I know well the conditions in eastern Kentucky and throughout Appalachia. For some 175 years, my family has lived in this great region. The people are of pioneer stock and through many generations have been ever faithful to the needs of their country. The spirit of its people is high despite the unhappy and contin-

uing problem of unemployment. But the development program proposed in this bill is required if our communities are to build the facilities to encourage industry to use the great resources that exist in the region. Increased flood protection, new highways and airports, more health and education facilities, and increased efforts at land improvement are vital.

This bill, S. 3, which we introduced today, authorizes the same expenditure of \$1,077 million over a period of 5 years, stated in the bill which I was pleased to cosponsor with Senator RANDOLPH in the Senate last year. We are, though, proposing to increase the total authorized road system mileage from 2,850 to 3,350 miles across the region, including 1,000 miles of access roads instead of the figure of 500 miles in the bill last year. The \$840 million for highway construction, providing up to 70 percent as the Federal share, is a basic program in this legislation, for roads will open isolated areas in Kentucky and in other Appalachian States to industry, to tourism, and to a fuller life for the people of the area.

In addition to the increase in authorized road mileage, this bill would place greater responsibilities and authority on the States, and I am sure that this will be welcomed by the States. This emphasis on the approval of programs at the local and State level, along with the incentives for private investment, will do much both to close the economic gap between this section and other regions of the United States, and to raise the standards of living.

The Appalachian development program is the result of much study. It is directed to a great and evident need. If the Congress approves this program providing support for transportation and flood protection, as well as for education and community development, then the 15 million people living in the hills and valleys in the Appalachian regions of 11 States—including eastern Kentucky—can work to achieve the same levels of abundance that are found in most of America.

I am grateful to my friend from West Virginia for his work and for his kind words. I will join him in the Public Works Committee to secure the earliest possible hearings and to bring this bill before the Senate. I hope others will again join with us in support of this bill. It will benefit Appalachian States, but it will also benefit the Nation.

#### THE WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill (S. 4) amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

This legislation is, with two exceptions, identical to that which passed the Senate on October 16, 1963, and in which 21 Members of this body joined me as cosponsors. I would add that the legislation was approved by the Senate by a vote of 69 yeas and 11 nays, and of the 20 Members not voting, 15 announced themselves as favoring its passage. The House Public Works Committee reported an amended version during the closing days of the 88th Congress. However, no

further action was taken by the other body.

The bill which I am introducing is cosponsored by 25 of my colleagues, including all members of our Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. It is a bipartisan measure directed toward improving the quality of our water resources and making more effective our programs for the control and abatement of water pollution.

This proposal is consistent with and supports the objectives outlined by President Johnson in his state of the Union message, in which he called for an expanded conservation program as part of our effort to achieve the great society:

For over 3 centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage. In a fruitful new partnership with the States and cities the next decade should be a conservation milestone.

We will seek legal power to prevent pollution of our air and water before it happens. We will step up our effort to control harmful wastes, giving just priority to the cleanup of our most contaminated rivers. We will increase research to learn much more about the control of pollution.

These objectives and approaches are reflected in S. 4.

As I mentioned previously, this legislation is, with two exceptions, identical to S. 649, as approved by this body October 16, 1963. The sections deleted were those relating to the control and abatement of pollution from Federal installations and the problem of nondegradable detergents.

The Federal installations section was eliminated from this bill because similar problems with respect to Federal installations are present in the field of air pollution, as well as water pollution. In addition, there were other matters relating to Federal activities in both fields which require separate and more complete consideration. Because of these factors it was decided to cover these matters in separate legislation which will be introduced within a week.

The detergents section was deleted because the members of the coal and detergent industry have reported changes in their schedules for supplying the market with detergents which will degrade more readily than those presently on the market. In view of this change in schedule, it is considered advisable to conduct additional hearings on the detergent problem to determine the type or need of corrective legislation.

S. 4 includes the following proposals which were contained in S. 649 as it passed the Senate in October 1963:

First. To establish an additional position of Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to help the Secretary to administer the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Second. To create a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to administer sections 3, comprehensive programs; 4, interstate cooperation and uniform laws; 10, enforcement measures; and 11, to control pollution from Federal installations.

Third. To authorize appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for 3 succeeding fiscal years in the